REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the above-captioned patent application. Claims 5, 8, 11, 16, and 19 were withdrawn in the Response to Election of Species Requirement electronically filed on October 5, 2006 and are still withdrawn.

The Office Communication of January 22, 2007 points out that, while Species B is illustrated in Figs. 9-15, the species elected in the Response to Election of Species Requirement electronically filed on October 5, 2006 was that of Fig. 9-14, thereby creating confusion for the examiner. Accordingly, Applicants hereby elect the species of Figs. 9-15. Because the examiner acknowledged in the January 22, 2007 Office Communication the point that was made by the undersigned in the October 5, 2006 Response that, according to M.P.E.P. § 806.04(e), "[c]laims are never species" but rather, "[s]pecies are always the specifically different embodiments," the election of the species of Figs. 9-15 in the present paper is made without traverse.

The undersigned contends that claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-15, 17, 18, and 20 read upon the species of Figs. 9-15. However, in the January 22, 2007 Office Communication, the examiner suggested that claim 17 is directed to species C (i.e., the species of Figs. 16-21). It appears that the examiner is mistaken with regard to the scope of claim 17, because claim 17 does, in fact, read on species B of Fig. 9-15. It is not until claim 19, which has been withdrawn, that aspects of the "lower portion" of the species C of Figs. 16-21 is explicitly claimed via the recitation in claim 19 of "a bowl-shaped subportion of the lower portion." With regard to the "lower portion" of species B of Figs. 9-15, as referred to in claim 17, see the lower portion 219 shown in Fig. 13, for example. There is no requirement in claim 17 that the recited "lower portion" be "bowl-shaped," or any other shape for that matter, and so the lower portion 219 of species B of Figs. 9-15 clearly meets this aspect of claim 17. Thus, claim 17 reads on the species B of Figs. 9-15 and also reads on species C of Figs. 16-21. As such, it is contended that claim 17 need not be withdrawn. The present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

In the event that there are any questions related to this paper or to the application in general, the undersigned would appreciate the opportunity to address those questions directly in a telephone interview to expedite the prosecution of this application for all concerned. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (317) 231-7341 to discuss any outstanding issues

or concerns so that allowance of the present application may be expedited. It is respectfully requested that, if necessary to effect a timely response, this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response and that shortages in fees, if any, be charged to the Account of Barnes & Thornburg, Deposit Account No. 10-0435, with reference to our file 3044-73785.

Respectfully submitted,

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP Rosald J. Herdeson

Ronald S. Henderson Attorney Reg. No. 43669

Indianapolis, Indiana 317-231-7341